

U.S. Appln. No. 09/925,586
Amendment Dated Sep. 30, 2005
Reply to Office Action of June 30, 2005
Docket No. BOC9-2000-0032 (178)

REMARKS

These remarks are made in response to the Office Action of June 30, 2005 (Office Action). As this response is timely filed within the three-month statutory period, no fee is believed due.

In paragraph 1 of the Office Action, Claims 19 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,405,126 to Palomo, *et al.* (hereinafter "Palomo") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,405,123 to Rennard, *et al.* (hereinafter "Rennard").

Applicants have amended Claims 19 and 26 to further emphasize certain aspects of Applicants' invention. The amendments are supported throughout the Specification. (See, e.g., Specification, p. 8, line 18 – p. 9, line 3.) No new matter has been introduced by virtue of the amendments.

It may be useful to reiterate certain aspects of Applicants' invention prior to addressing the cited references. One embodiment of the invention, typified by amended Claim 19, is a method of vehicle navigation. The method includes accessing a publicly accessible Web site using a computing device that is remote from a vehicle, and identifying within the Web site at least one destination. Additionally, the method includes automatically determining navigation information for the destination, at least a portion of the navigation information including geographic coordinates for the destination.

The method further includes storing the navigation information in a memory remote from the vehicle, and providing a portable storage media containing the memory. The method also includes transferring the portable storage media to a self-contained, in-vehicle navigation device in order to transfer the navigation information. Additionally, the method includes determining whether a data format of the navigation information conforms to data requirements of the in-vehicle navigation device prior to transferring the

{WP260485;1}

U.S. Appln. No. 09/925,586
Amendment Dated Sep. 30, 2005
Reply to Office Action of June 30, 2005
Docket No. BOC9-2000-0032 (178)

navigation information, and, if not, converting the data format to an alternate data format prior to transferring the navigation information the in-vehicle navigation device.

As already noted, Claims 19 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Palomo in view of Rennard. Palomo discloses a method by which the agents of a vehicle rental facility use a computing device to program navigation information. The navigation information is subsequently transferred to an in-vehicle navigation device. This is intended to permit a car rental customer to use the in-vehicle navigation device without having to program the navigation device.

It is noted at page 2 of the Office Action that Palomo does not disclose a computing device that accesses a publicly accessible Web site as recited in the claims. It is asserted, however, that this feature is disclosed by Rennard.

Rennard teaches a navigation system that includes a portable device that continuously communicates with a navigational server. The navigational server performs navigational tasks and repetitively provides navigational prompts to the portable device. This arrangement is intended to permit the portable navigation device to function as a thin client or presentation unit for presenting navigation information processed by the navigation server even though the portable device itself is not capable of independent navigation.

Rennard, however, does not teach or suggest providing navigation information to a self-contained, in-vehicle navigation system as recited in amended Claims 19 and 26. Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that the prior art fails to provide any teaching, suggestion, or motivation for combining Rennard with Palomo. As already noted, Palomo is explicitly intended to provide a vehicle navigational system that can be used without a user's programming information into the navigational system. Indeed, Palomo expressly teaches that users such as rental car customers often lack the sophistication needed to program and operate a navigation system without the assistance of a third party.

(WP260485;1)

U.S. Appln. No. 09/925,586
Amendment Dated Sep. 30, 2005
Reply to Office Action of June 30, 2005
Docket No. BOC9-2000-0032 (178)

By contrast, Rennard teaches the use of a Web site as a convenient alternative environment explicitly intended to provide user-supplied input. Consequently, since users of the Palomo system explicitly do not input information, one would not turn from Palomo to Rennard for alternative input environments. Indeed, objectives fulfilled by Palomo render teachings of a user-provided input environment moot in so far as Palomo is explicitly confined to use within a rental car environment having skilled agents. Applicants respectfully submit that the teachings of Rennard conflict with the teachings of Palomo and that Rennard and Palomo should not be combined.

Applicants further respectfully assert that neither Palomo nor Rennard, alone or in combination, teach or suggest other features recited in amended Claims 19 and 26. For example, neither reference teaches or suggests that determining whether a data format of navigation information conforms to data requirements of an in-vehicle navigation device prior to transferring the navigation information to the in-vehicle navigation device. Nor does either reference teach or suggest that, prior to transferring navigation information to an in-vehicle navigation device, the data format of the navigation information is to be converted to an alternate data format if the initial data format does not conform to data requirements of the in-vehicle navigation device.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully maintain that the prior art does not provide a teaching, suggestion, or motivation for combining Palomo and Rennard and that, even when combined, the references do not teach every feature recited in amended Claims 19 and 26. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims define over the prior art.

Applicants believe that the application in its present form is now in full condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested. The Applicants request that the Examiner call the undersigned if clarification is needed on any matter within this

{WP260485;1}

U.S. Appln. No. 09/925,586
Amendment Dated Sep. 30, 2005
Reply to Office Action of June 30, 2005
Docket No. BOC9-2000-0032 (178)

Amendment, or if the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of the subject application to completion.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 30, 2005

Richard A. Hinson

Gregory A. Nelson, Registration No. 30,577
Richard A. Hinson, Registration No. 47,652
Marc Boillot, Registration No. 56,164
AKERMAN SENTERFITT
Customer No. 40987
Post Office Box 3188
West Palm Beach, FL 33402-3188
Telephone: (561) 653-5000

{WP260485;1}